

Appl. No. 10/693,471  
Atty. Docket No. 1001-023 (25814.024)  
Amtd. Dated June 22, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2007

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 are pending; and of these, claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 have been specifically amended. Reconsideration of the subject application in view of this Paper is respectfully requested.

The Office Action states that the provided title of the invention is not descriptive. Applicants have amended the title, as provided hereinabove; whereby the additional description provided is believed to obviate further objection. Accordingly, it is kindly requested that the instant objection be withdrawn.

On pages 2-4, the Office Action provides that claims 1, 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0179779 to Oochi et al. (hereinafter “Oochi”). On pages 4-5, the Office Action provides that claims 2, 3, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oochi in view of Nerwin v. Erlichman and In re Japiske. On pages 5-7, the Office Action provides that claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oochi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,753,911 to Yamada et al. (hereinafter “Yamada”). With respect to Applicants’ claims in view of this Paper, the rejection thereof is respectfully traversed.

A rejection of a claim on the basis of anticipation requires that the single piece of prior art being applied show, either expressly or inherently, each element of the claim. As may be seen on the attached “Listing of Claims”, Applicants have chosen to specifically amend independent claims 1 and 5 in a manner which clarifies the subject matter for which claim

coverage is sought. In particular, amended claim 1 recites a lens apparatus and claim 5 recites a camera, each of which comprises “. . . a lens holding member which holds the lens, the stop blade, the optical filter and the shutter blade, wherein one or two members selected from the group consisting of the stop blade, the optical filter and the shutter blade is/are arranged at one end side of the lens holding member and the other member selected from the group is arranged at the other end side of the lens holding member.”

Independent claim 9 is likewise amended by virtue of its recitation which comprises independent claim 1.

As to the claims as now amended, Oochi fails to show the constructions presented by this Paper. In particular, Oochi, in its Figure 2, discloses the ordered arrangement of a lens 31, diaphragm blade 34, shutter blade 35 and filter 33. Each of these components is merely said to be part of a “lens part 11”, see paragraph [0037], and wherein such description is illustrated only diagrammatically by Oochi’s Figure 2. Thus, Oochi discloses a lens on one end of the “lens part,” a filter 33 disposed at the other end, and its shutter blade 35 and diaphragm blade 34 in the middle. Oochi is silent with respect to how each of the elements are held, whether by a single mechanism or multiple mechanisms within the lens part 11. In contrast, Applicant’s invention as provided by the claims as now amended features a construction in which one or two members of the group: stop blade, optical filter and shutter blade is/are arranged at one end side of the lens holding member and the other member (or members) is/are arranged at the other end side of the lens holding member. Herein, such construction enables achievement of the advantages discussed in Applicant’s specification with respect to, for instance, a lens barrel of reduced size which accommodates the mechanization associated with the members.

Appl. No. 10/693,471  
Atty. Docket No. 1001-023 (25814.024)  
Amdt. Dated June 22, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2007

Oochi, on the other hand and as addressed above, ignores such an advantage as demonstrated by its design, and in particular, placing its lens completely at one end and the other elements interspersed throughout the lens part. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that rejection of the claims as noted hereinabove is no longer appropriate, and it is requested that such rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 6 have been amended commensurate with the amendment to each of their respective independent claims 1 and 5.

In view of Applicant's claims as now amended and as discussed hereinabove, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is no longer appropriate in view of Oochi's demonstrated failings; and thus, it is requested that such rejection be withdrawn.

Accordingly, it is submitted, for all of the reasons presented, that the rejection of the claims is no longer appropriate in view of this Paper; thus, it is respectfully requested that such rejection be withdrawn.

It is submitted that the claims pending in the subject application are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the application and allowance thereof are respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that an interview would expedite consideration of this Amendment or of the application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned directly by calling (212) 790 – 9278.

Appl. No. 10/693,471  
Atty. Docket No. 1001-023 (25814.024)  
Amdt. Dated June 22, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2007

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17  
which may be required by Papers filed in this application to Deposit Account No.  
03-3415.

Dated: June **22**, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



COWAN, LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN, P. C.  
1133 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036  
T: (212) 790-9200

Brian H. Buck  
Reg. No. 48,776